Of

EXHIBITS

Doc.	Def.	Pros.	Description	For Ident.	In Evidence
1313	2722		Telegram from Weizsacker German Vice-Foreign Minister to Ambassado Ott in Tokyo, dated 21 June 1939		24178
1632	2723		Memorandum signed by Woermann, Director of the Political Department of the German Foreign Office dated 20 July 1939	э,	24179
1633	2724		Telegram sent by Weizsa to Schulenberg, Germ Ambassador in Moscow dated 22 July 1939	an	24185
704	2725		The Non-Aggression Pact Between Germany and Union of USSR conclu- 23 August 1939	rue	24187
1634	2726		Telegram from Mackensen German Ambassador in Rome to the German Foreign Office, date 23 August 1939		24190
1529	2727		Excerpt from "Peace and War" published by th U. S. State Departme which is a Memorandu signed by Hull re a Conversation with the Japanese Ambassador HORINOUCHI	nt,	24195

Of

EXHIBITS

(cont'd)

Doc. No.	Def. No.	Pros.	The state of the s	For dent.	In Evidence
710	2728		Statement of Premier HIRANUMA showing that the HIRANUMA Cabinet resigned as a result of the German-Russian Treat (previously marked f identification only transcript page 17,836)	or	24202
246	2729		Statement of the ABE Cabinet dated 4 September 1939 show- ing that the Japan- ese Government made clear that it had abandoned the pro- Axis Policy		24206
			MORNING RECESS		24207
1400-D-3	2730		Excerpt from "Foreign Relations of the U. S.", which is a telegram of Ambassad Grew to Secretary of State dated 18 Decem 1939 re Conversation Between Ambassador Grew and Foreign Minister NOMURA on that date	ber,	24209

Of

EXHIBITS

(cont'd)

Toc.	Def. No.	Pros.	Description	For Ident.	In Evidence
1400-0-3	2731		Excerpt from "Fore Relations of the S., Japan 1931-1 Which is a teleg from Grow to Hall dated 20 December 1939	0. 941" rem	94213
1631	2732		The 4th Conversati in Tokyo Concern the Question of cluding a New Tr of Commerce Betw NOMURA and Grew, 22 December 1939	con- eaty een dated	24216
1636	2733		Telegram from Amba Mackensen in Rom the German Forei Office, dated 27 May 1940	e to	24227
			NOON RECESS		24237
155	2734		Message of the Pri Minister Prince KONOYE, dated 27 September 1940 - excerpt from pro cution document		
		*	777-A		24276

Of

WITNESSES

Defense' Witnesses	Page
SAITO, Ryoei	24239
Direct by Mr. Cunningham	24239
(Witness excused)	24252
A PREDNOON BECESS	24259

Thursday, 12 June 1947

1 2

INTERNATIONAL MILITARY TRIBUNAL
FOR THE FAR EAST
Court House of the Tribunal
War Ministry Building
Tokyo, Japan

The Tribunal met, pursuant to adjournment, at 0930.

Appearances:

For the Tribunal, all Members sitting, with the exception of: HONORABLE JUSTICE E. H. NORTHCROFT, Member from the Dominion of New Zealand, not sitting from 0930 to 1600; HONORABLE JUSTICE JU-AO MEI, Member from the Republic of China, not sitting from 1330 to 1600.

For the Prosecution Section, same as before. For the Pefense Section, same as before.

(English to Japanese and Japanese to English interpretation was made by the Language Section, IMTFE.)

Greenberg & Lefler

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Tribunal for the Far East is now in session.

THE PRESIDENT: Kr. Blewett.

MR. BLEWETT: Mr. President and Members of the Tribunal, the next stage in these proceedings is what the defense terms generally "the Pacific War." The evidence will be quite comprehensive. The opening statement is under revision, outlining the theory of the defense, and it will be read by Japanese counsel. We request the permission of the Tribunal to defer its delivery until after the recess, where it will be more helpful to the court.

At this time, all the evidence is available in one sub-division of the Pacific phase, which has been carefully prepared. We ask the indulgence of the Tribunal for permission to present the proof regarding the Tri-Partite Pact now. No other evidence to come will conflict with it or be repetitive.

I present Mr. Cunningham, who is the chairman of that sub-division.

THE PRESIDENT: How long will that take?

MR. BLEWETT: We expect, sir, that it will take up to the 23rd. We hope to complete it just about that time.

THE PRESIDENT: If we should agree to what

you propose and we finish the Tri-Partite Pact section before the 23rd, the vacation, or recess, will commence as from the time we finish the Tri-Partite Pact section.

MR. BLEWETT: That is quite satisfactory, sir.

THE PRESIDENT: What have you to say, Mr.

Tavenner?

MR. TAVENNER: If the Tribunal please, the prosecution does not understand the reason for post-poning the opening statement of this phase for a period of nearly two months.

THE PRESIDENT: I suppose if they are not ready to ready to present the phase, they are not ready to open on it. One follows from the other, I would say. You made it clear enough to us, either here or in Chambers -- you, the defense, I mean -- that you were not prepared to go on with that general phase. Not only were you not prepared with the individual cases, but you were not prepared with the general phase. I say that with a purpose, but it is in accordance with fact.

Every alternative to a recess was considered by us. We were told they could not go ahead with that general phase. Therefore, they cannot be expected to open on it properly.

MR. TAVENNER: I had not understood, if the

2

4

5

6

8

9

10

12

14

13

15

17

18

20

21

23

Tribunal please, that they were not prepared to go ahead with their opening statement; that they merely requested that it be delayed.

THE PRESIDENT: An opening statement implies that you know every essential matter you are going to prove.

We have to take the decision of the Court on this, first.

I understand we will have an opening Statement on the Tri-Partite Pact, Mr. Cunningham.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Yes, your Honor, and I believe you will find it very brief.

THE PRESIDENT: The Tribunal approves of the defense proposal. So, you may open the Tri-Partite Pact section, Mr. Cunningham.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Opening statement, Tri-Partite Pact, Pacific Division V, Sub-Division 1: the Tri-Partite Pact was concluded between Japan, Germany and Italy on 27 September, 1940.

The prosecution alledged that it was an extension or revival of the abortive negotiations for the so-called "strengthening of the Anti-Comintern Pact," which were conducted between the three countries in 1938 and 1939, and that "this pact in its essence contained the ultimate development of the plot of the

1

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

16

17 18

19

20

21

23

24

improvement of Japanese-American relations. They made every effort to attain this objective and that the Japanese-German relations during the period remained extremely cool. The efforts of Japan were not reciprocated by the United States. Economic pressure upon Japan increased by the United States and other countries after the expiration of the Japanese-American Commercial Treaty.

The German victory in Europe in May 1940 gave Japan reason to fear the emergence of Germany in East Asia as successor to France and the Netherlands. The coolness of the Japanese-German relations at that time did not permit any possibility of collaboration of the two countries concerning these Far Eastern problems. The prosecution has tendered evidence of Japanese-German contact concerning the question of Netherlands East Indies and French Indo-China, especially conversation between Ribbentrop and SATO, alleging the existence of collaboration. It will be proved that these facts show the contrary; noncollaboration between Japan and Germany. It will also be shown that the negotiations for the Tri-Partite Pact began in September, 1940 under the KONOYE Cabinet, and not in June of the same year as alleged by the prosecution.

23

22

1

3

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

24

The prosecution alleged that the purpose of the Tri-Partite Pact was the establishment of the so-called "new order," which had for its purpose the extinguishment of democracy throughout the world and the subjugation of all the nations by the aggressive states.

1

2

3

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

In rebuttal of this charge, it will be proved that the Japanese Government concluded the Tri-Partite Pact for the defensive and peaceful purpose of contributing to the world peace; Japan wanted ultimately to improve the relations with all countries of the world, especially with the United States of America, on the basis of equality and mutual respect. She thought it necessary, as the primary step for it, to prevent the deterioration of her political position by getting out of the international isolation which faced her at that time. After the failure of her policy of direct approach to the Anglo-Saxon countries and facing the danger of complete international isolation as a result of increasing American pressure, Japan was compelled to the conclusion that her ultimate goal, the improvement of the Japanese-American relations, could not be attained without first improving her international political situation. By joining with other countries, even if some danger should there be involved, this must be done under the international circumstances

then prevailing, Germany and Italy were the only countries which could be used as allies. That the Japanese Government had no aggressive purpose and took every precaution in order not to be drawn into the European war as a result of the Tri-Partite Pact will be shown by the official record of the negotiations and will be the object of part of our evidence.

On the interpretation of the term "new order" it will be shown by evidence that it meant the establishment of a regional organization as part of the world peace program. It was not aggressive in its nature. It was not in violation of any existing treaties and obligations. Evidence will be tendered proving the fantasy of the allegation that leaders of Japan and Germany contemplated conquest or division of the world. As to the prosecution's charge that the pledge of mutual assistance as provided in the pact would become effective automatically, it will be proved that this was not so.

Concerning the Japanese-German-Italian relations after the conclusion of the Tri-Partite Pact until the outbreak of the Pacific War, the defense will prove that there was no cooperation by pointing out the following facts, namely, that:

(1) Germany wanted Japan to join the war

against Britain;

(2) Germany, after the outbreak of the German-Russian war, wanted Japan to go against Soviet Russia when the German Army was knocking at the door of Moscow;

(3) Germany did not wish a Japanese-American war; Japan acted independently in the war with the United States.

Most of the evidence presented by the prosecution with respect to the Singapore question are documents of the German Government, which by their own nature are one-sided.

Skipping, then, down to the next paragraph.

The defense will tender evidence that Japan always refused in a diplomatic way German request to enter the war against Britain. These requests were contradiction of assurances given by Germany at the time of the conclusion of the Pact. It will be clearly shown that the records of various conversations introduced by the prosecution kept by the German Foreign Office were not official or accurate, and that the German leaders were not telling Foreign Minister MATSUOKA the truth when he visited Berlin in March and April, 1941.

against Britain;

(2) Germany, after the outbreak of the German-Russian war, wanted Japan to go against Soviet Russia when the German Army was knocking at the door of Moscow;

(3) Germany did not wish a Japanese-American war; Japan acted independently in the war with the United States.

Most of the evidence presented by the prosecution with respect to the Singapore question are documents of the German Government, which by their own nature are one-sided.

Skipping, then, down to the next paragraph.

The defense will tender evidence that Japan

always refused in a diplomatic way German request to enter the war against Britain. These requests were contradiction of assurances given by Germany at the time of the conclusion of the Pact. It will be clearly shown that the records of various conversations introduced by the prosecution kept by the German Foreign Office were not official or accurate, and that the German leaders were not telling Foreign Minister MATSUOKA the truth when he visited Berlin in March and April, 1941.

B

Towards Soviet Russia, Japan strove to maintain a friendly relation in accordance with the stipulation and spirit of the Tri-Partite Pact. She emphatically refused repeated German demands to join her in the war against Soviet Russia. Evidence will also be tendered to show that Japan considered the German attack on Russia which occurred in spite of her opposition, as a betrayal on the part of Germany, and considered that the very foundation of the Tri-Partite Pact was shattered by this act of Germany.

The prosecution has pointed to the Japanese occupation of French Indo-China as instances of Japanese-German collaboration. It will be shown, that in the solutions of these problems Japan did not utilize German pressure on the French home Government.

Japanese-German relations experiences further set-back when the Japanese Government entered
in informal negotiations with the United States in
April 1941. Germany entertained doubts as to Japan's
intentions, and requested that Germany be informed of
the facts about the negotiations and be permitted to
participate in them, but Japan did not comply with
this. Evidence will also be tandered on this point.

The circumstances which compelled Japan to

decide the war with the United States of America will be clarified thoroughly in other sub-divisions of this phase.

It will be shown that the Japanese decision resulted from consideration of self-defense, independently of any exterior influences, not to mention any consultation with Germany and Italy, and that Japan did not accept any assistance or help from the two countries in setting up her plans of military operations. On the centrary, Japan kept her decision to fight strictly secret, and the attack on Pearl Harbor was most complete a surprise to Germany, to which fact evidence will be tendered. It will also be shown on the other hand that German declaration of war on the United States of America was not connected with the Tripartite Pact, and Germany considered herself to be de facto in a state of war with the United States since the "shoot at sight" order of President Rossevelt in September 1941.

convincing evidence will be tendered not enly from Japanese and German, but also from Allied sources, as to the fact that Japanese-German-Italian relations during the war were not close, making the military convention practically valueless, but in contrast to the intimate cooperation of the Allied

2

1

5

4

7

9

10

12

13 14

15 16

17

18 19

20

21

22

24

side, politically, economically and militarily,

Japan and the two countries of Germany and Italy in

fact fought separate wars.

It should be observed by the Tribunal that the effect of the Italian relationship with Germany and Japan is ignored in our presentation of the evidence. History has already shown that Italy was impotent and a useless ally, and even in the optimistic evaluation of her aid in any cause the result would have to be nil. The fact that she surrendered in 1943 and that Germany surrendered in 1945 and that Japan surrendered later precludes any necessity of justifying or explaining No-Separate Peace Pact mentioned so often by the prosecution in their evidence.

With the permission of the Tribunal I present documents and witnesses supporting this brief statement.

Before I present my documents, I would like to say, if the Tribunal please, that I should like to have it definitely understood that my presentation of the evidence in this Tri-Partite Section of the Pacific Division of this case must not be taken to indicate that Mr. OSHIMA had anything to do with the negetiation or the deliberations which brought

about the pact.

12

13

14

To the contrary, I wish to emphasize that Mr. OSHIMA was in complete retirement from November 1939 to February 1941. I would like to have the Tribunal bear that in mind, please.

Before we present the evidence in this matter it would probably be most helpful if Mr. Tavenner would state the prosecution's position with relation to the Tri-Partite Pact in order that we will meet the issue squarely, perhaps eliminate some instead of approaching the matter by tangents and collaterally. This procedure proved most agreeable on the question of the Anti-Comintern Pact.

Our evidence is prepared on the theory that
the making of a defensive international agreement by
two or more nations through their plenipotentiaries is
the exercise of an inherent legal right of nations;
that there is absolutely no personal responsibility
on the part of individuals for the acts or the consequences. We understand that it is the prosecution's
claim that the defendants individually or collective—
y are charged with violating international agree—
thents. They claim such agreements constitute inter—
the making of a defensive international agree—
the making of a defensive internations;
the making of a defensive international agreement is a defensive internations;
the making of a defensive international agreement is a defensive internation international agreements.

The offense, we consider, is in breach of agreements, not the execution or negotiation of

them. Their position is far from clear on this question.

THE PRESIDENT: Just tender your evidence, Mr. Cunningham. We will hear all your points later. We have heard most of them. We will hear them again, perhaps.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: In tendering evidence of the first sub-division, I want to prove the break-down of Japanese-German relations caused by the conclusion of the German-Russian Non-Aggression Treaty on 23 August 1939, in order to show that no continuity existed in the relation between Japan and Germany as charged by the prosecution.

I offer in evidence defense document No.

1313, a telegram from Weizsacker, German Vice

Foreign Minister, to Ambassader Ott in Tekyo, dated

21 June 1939, to show that as early as June of 1939

Germany was no more seriously interested in an agreement with Japan, for which negotiations were going

on since the summer of 1938.

This document and the next two documents are preliminary, furnishing the basis and back-ground for documents to be tendered later.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 1313 will receive exhibit No. 2722. (Whereupen, the decument above re-ferred to was marked defense exhibit No. 2722 and received in evidence.)

Spratt & Yelder

PR. CUNNINGHAM: Skipping the formal parts (reading):

"Personally for the Ambassador only on telegram No. 257.

"The Reich Foreign linister wishes to tell you that he absolutely agrees to continuing your individual talks in accordance with the information conveyed to you. He wishes, however, to ask you not to press now the question of the conclusion of the treaty with respect to the time."

Signed, "Weizsacker."

We next offer in evidence defense document 1632, one of the three preliminary documents, a memorandum signed by Woermann, Director of the Political Department of the German Foreign Office, dated 20 July 1939, to show bad faith of Germany towards Japan in concealing the fact that negotiations for a non-aggression treaty were going on between Germany and Russia at that time.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 1632

will receive exhibit No. 2723.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 2723 and received in evidence.)

IR..CUNNINGHAM: Skipping the formal parts (reading):

"Berlin, 19 July 1939.

"The Japanese Counsellor of the Embassy who was apparently dispatched by his Ambassador to gain information, visited me today and began a talk with an extremely detailed explanation of the late incident which occurred on the border between Manchukuo and Outer Mongolia. The events, according to his explanations, occurred in the area where a river called Halahaho on most maps forms the border line. It is true that there exists no clear agreement on the border line, but the said river has been practically recognized as the border line. Since April of this year Outer Mongolia troops at first appeared on the east side of the river again and again; later they were reinforced with Russian troops. At the same time Outer-Longolian or Russian airplanes often appeared over Manchurian territory. In one case an airplane flew deep into the land and dropped a bomb upon a bridge about 30 - 40 km to the east of Tsitsihar. Finally the Mongolians and Russians in large formation have appeared on the east side of the river and that with motorized troops and tanks.

22 23 24

1

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

units developed, whereby the Japanese gained the upperhand. The fighting activities, however, have not yet entirely ceased along the whole line. The Outer-Hongolians and Russians have lost thousands of men and hundreds of airplanes. On the Manchurian side, Japanese troops have also taken part in the battle. The total loss of our side amounts to about 1000 men. As to the reason of such Russian action, the Japanese Government is entirely de-

"Thereupon, a pitched battle with major

"Another possibility might be to give a kind of moral help to the Englishmen in relation to the occurrence in Tientsin. A third interpretation is that the Russians are desiring to display, in consideration of the negotiation in Noseow that they are not interested in the events in Europe but that they are looking toward the Far East.

pendent upon a supposition: The action might have

the aim to ascertain whether the Japanese despite

the warlike events in China are still strong enough

"Finally, it is even insisted that the Russians are eager to create difficulties between the Anti-Comintern Powers in this way.

"Hereupon, Mr. Usami apparently reached

also in Manchukuo.

1 2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

24

25

the point to which he was steering. First he inquired after our information about the English-French-Russian negotiations.

"I have given him our information concerning the negotiation of the Western Powers with Moscow, which coincided with his own.

"Then he inquired after our relation with the Soviet Union in a very emphatic form.

"He referred among others to a report of the 'News Chroncicle,' according to which a nonaggression pact between Germany and Russia is now being negotiated and which mentioned the rumor of the dispatch of prominent German persons to Moseow

"I replied to him that all those news were nothing but a swindle. It is true that we are now keeping contact with Soviet Union because of an economic negotiation. The quantity of trade between us has been reduced to an insignificant sum from its very considerable height in former times. There are plenty of useful things in Russia, which we can utilize quite well, so it is quite natural that we are trying to further our economic relation to some degree. This has lead to nothing more than preliminary diplomatic talks, being held partly in Hoscow, partly in Berlin.

1

2

4

5

7

8

9

10

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

"Fr. Usami then inquired after the details on the German credits given to the Soviet Union in former days. I have referred him to Mr. Wiehl for further information on this question.

"Mr. Usami then came out with the following: Between Germany and Japan economic negotiations are also being held at this moment. Japan is extraordinarily capable of accepting German machines. Our negotiations, however, have explained that the German capacity in this connection is restricted and that some sort of machines could not be delivered because of her own requirements. It would make an extremely unpleasant impression in Japan, if those machines which Japan had been denied would yet be sent to the Soviet Union. I have referred Mr. Usami to Mr. Wiehl also in this point. In the end the Counsellor of the Embassy came back again to the rumour on the political rapprochement between Germany and the Soviet Union and said it would be anyway quite good, if a soothing declaration in this regard be given in Tokyo. The Embassy has on its part already reported to that effect.

"During our talk I have also stated upon inquiries that it is a known fact that the German

press does not attack the Soviet Union to such a degree as in the past, and described this as a fact which implies nothing sensational because of the neighborhood of the Soviet Union with Poland."

Signed, "Woermann."

I now offer in evidence defense document
No. 1633, the last of the three preliminary documents,
a telegram sent by Weizsacker to Schulenburg, German
ambassador in Moscow, dated 22 July 1939, to show
that Germany was contacting Russia already in July
1939 for a political understanding.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 1633

will receive exhibit No. 2724.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 2724 and received in evidence.)

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Skipping the formal parts, (Reading):

"For the Ambassador:

"Referring to the telegraphic information No. 132.

"Barbarin called on Schnurre as announced by you and declared himself as authorized to negotiate here and also to sign the treaty in Berlin. Depending upon the progress of the talks we will reserve the decision to us, whether a part of the negotiations should nevertheless be transferred to Moscow. In any case we will proceed here ready for outspoken concessions, because the conclusion -- and that at an

earliest possible date -- is welcome for general reasons.

"With respect to the purely political side of our talks with Russia, we consider the waiting period ordered to you by the telegraphic instruction No. 134 as expired. You are therefore authorized, without pressing in any way, again to spin the thread further and to utilize for that purpose especially conversations on current affairs.

"In case from the Russian side our relations to Japan should be brought to discussion, it is for you perhaps of interest to know that the Japanese ambassador in Berlin again as late as yesterday described the shootings and skirmishes in Outer Hongolia as not of importance.

"(Signed) Weizsacker"

I now offer in evidence defense document
No. 704, text of the non-aggression treaty between
Germany and Russia concluded on 23 August 1939, to
show that this pact was a clear violation of Article
II of the Secret Agreement attached to the AntiComintern Pact of 25 November 1936, exhibit No. 480,
in which Japan and Germany pledged each other not to
enter any agreement with Russia contrary to the spirit
of that agreement.

1 2

.

Through this treaty between Germany and Russia the Secret Agreement attached to the Anti-Comintern Pact was abolished politically.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 704

will receive exhibit No. 2725.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 2725 and received in evidence.)

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I now read exhibit No. 2725:

"The Non-Aggression Pact between Germany
and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

"The Government of Germany and the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, urged by the hope to consolidate peaceful relations between Germany and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and proceeding from the basic stipulations in the Neutrality Pact concluded between Germany and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in April, 1926, have arrived at the following agreement.

"Article I.

"Both contracting parties are under obligation not to initiate any military movement, any offensive action, or any invasion against each other, either single-handed or in conjunction with any other country.

2

1

5

6

8

9

11

12

13

14

16_.

18

19

. 20

21 22

23

24

1

"Article II.

3

2

"In case one of the contracting parties becomes the object of military action by a third party, the other contracting party will in no way

5

4

give support to the third party.

6

"Article III.

7

"The Governments of the two contracting powers, for the purpose of informing each other of

9

8

whatever problems involving their interests in common,

10

will constantly keep in touch and consult with each other also in the future.

11 12

"Article IV.

13

"Neither of the contracting parties will join any group of countries directly or indirectly

15

14

hostile to the other contracting party.

16

"Article V.

17 18

"In case any dispute or conflict with regard to some problem arises between the contracting parties,

19 20 they will settle the said dispute or conflict chiefly through friendly exchange of views or, if necessary,

21

through the establishment of an arbitration board.

23

"Article VI.

24

25

"The present Pact will remain in force for a term of ten years. If neither of the contracting parties notifies the other, a year before the Pact .7

expires, of its denunciation of the Pact, it will be considered that the operation of the Pact will automatically continue for the following five years.

"Article VII.

"The present Pact is to be ratified in the shortest possible time. The ratification acts will be exchanged in Berlin. The present Pact will come into force as soon as it is signed. Two copies of the present Pact, written in the German and Russian language, were made in Moscow on 23 August 1939.

"On behalf of the Government of Germany,

"Von Ribbentrop

"Authorized by the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics,

"S. Molotov."

I now call the Court's attention to prosecution's exhibit No. 775, transcript page 7890, KIDO's Diary of 23 August 1939, to show that bad faith in concluding the German-Russia Treaty shocked and surprised Japan.

KIDO wrote that he "was astonished at this extremely treacherous act considering the existence of the Anti-Comintern Pact and Secret Pact."

I now offer in evidence defense document
No. 1634, a telegram from Mackensen, German Ambassador
in Rome, to the German Foreign Office dated 23 August

1939 to show that the German-Russian Treaty stirred deep indignation in Japan as reported by the Italian Ambassador in Tokyo, and a complete breakdown of the Japanese-German-Italian relations was obvious.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 1634

will receive exhibit No. 2726.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 2726 and received in evidence.)

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I now read from exhibit 2726, skipping the formal parts:

"Top Secret! No. 364 of 23.8

"Top secret. Referring to my long distance telephone talk with Counsellor of the Legation, Hewel. Count Ciano requested me to come to see him this evening and according to a report of the Italian Ambassador in Tokyo, he related, 'Since this report seems to be of very important nature, please transmit it at the earliest possible moment. It will enable us to take counter measures with speed and force.' The Ambassador's report is based upon a report of his military attache, who was called yesterday (evening) to the Japanese War Ministry, and told that: The Non-Aggression Pact now to be concluded in Moscow has

caused deep indignation in Japan towards Germany; that it will mean betrayal to the German-Japanese friendship and to the spirit of the Anti-Comintern Pact, especially when Japan has never been informed of such intention in advance. The Ambassador anticipates the below-mentioned possible developments: (To what extent is this report based upon the conversation, which the military attache had in the War Ministry? It is not clear whether the report is based upon the ambassador's own opinion. Ciano said the Ambassador, in this connection, is an especially calm observer.) 1. Collapse of the present government and formation of a new pro-British cabinet. 2. Change of the Japanese foreign policy. 3. Recall of the Ambassador from Berlin and probably of that from Rome. 4. Sending of reinforcements to the Kwantung Army to keep balance with the Russian reinforcement of strength.

"The Ambassador's report continues that if the Axis Powers intend to interfere with the attitude of Japan, something must be done, and that the Japanese Army has declared to have received no direct information from Berlin and Rome up to the present. Ciano has immediately sent instructions to the Ambassador in Tokyo requesting him to explain to the Japanese that

22 23 24

3

4

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1. the Italian Policy has never been changed and her friendliness and understanding towards Japan also remain unchanged, that 2. the Japanese in judging the situation should remember that weakening of either England and France in Europe is only to her advantages, that 3. recall of the Ambassadors would be an unprecedented measure and would only aggravate the situation, which, after all our efforts, has been smoothed out and seems to be in no way unfavorable for Japan.

"Finally it is desired that the Ambassador assure the Japanese that they should continue to have full confidence in Italy as in the past. Attaching an extreme importance to the Ambassador's report, Ciano said that he hope that Germany also would do everything possible through her Ambassador and press to calm down the Japanese. Ciano thus concluded his report.

10

11

12

14

16

17

"(Signed) Mackensen."

I now call the Court's attention to prosecution exhibit No. 486-L, transcript page 6122-6123, a telegram sent by Ott to Berlin on 25 August 1939 to show that Japan protested to Germany upon conclusion of the Non-Aggression Treaty with Russia and broke off the negotiations, Foreign Minister ARITA stating to Ambassador Ott that "the Japanese Government had interpreted the conclusion of the Non-Aggression Pact

as finally terminating the present negotiations between Japan, Germany and Italy."

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Tavenner.

MR. TAVENNER: If the Tribunal please, I feel it is necessary to again call to the Tribunal's attention the fact that exhibits are being frequently inserted in the order list as an excuse for making an argument to the Tribunal at this time. Of the 91 documents that appear on this order list 26 are exhibits that have been previously introduced. With the exception of a few instances the documents have been read in entirety. I submit that the only purpose that could be had in placing these exhibits on the order list is to afford the opportunity of making a speech or an argument, and previous references by the prosecution and by the Tribunal to this matter seems not to have corrected the situation.

THE PRESIDENT: Stating a purpose sometimes involves an argument. It will be sufficient merely to refer to some of these exhibits which are being read in extenso. The purpose of tendering some of these documents is so transparently clear that there is no need to state it. We hope that Mr. Cunningham will not, in stating his purpose, resort to argument and that he will state his purpose only when that is

1 2

necessary and in the clearest and the fewest terms.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Your Honor, may I say just a word in explanation?

The purpose in referring to these prosecution documents is to save time. By mere reference to what the document of the prosecution does for us we aim to save putting on a witness or putting on several individual documents, and I think it is more profitable to use the prosecution's document against them than one of our documents against them.

THE PRESIDENT: We seek the fullest cooperation of the defense in saving time.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Exhibit No. 782 is a note dated 26 August 1939 sent by the Japanese Embassy in Berlin to the German Foreign Office. It is shown in this document that the Japanese Embassy in Berlin had filed, under the direction of the home government, a note with the German Foreign Office protesting against the conclusion of the German-Soviet Non-Aggression Pact. (Transcript page 7912).

1 2

I now offer in evidence defense document
No. 1529, an excerpt from "Peace and War," published
by the United States State Department, which is a
memorandum signed by Hull concerning a conversation
with the Japanese Ambassador HORINOUCHI, dated 26
August 1939, to show that Japan communicated to the
United States Government the breaking off of the
negotiations with Germany and declared the intention
to adopt a new foreign policy.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 1529

will receive exhibit No. 2727.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 2727 and received in evidence.)

MR. CUMNINGHAM (Reading:

"Excerpt from 'Peace and War.'

"Memorandum by the Secretary of State
Regarding Conversation with the Japanese Ambassador
(HCRINOUCHI).

"Washington, August 26, 1939.

"The Ambassador of Japan called at his own request. He proceeded to refer to the reports, already published in the American press, to the effect that American officials were incorrectly

attributing anti-American movements and demonstrations in China to Japanese officials or to their
influence in thus instigating the Chinese. The
Ambassador handed me the attached paper which I
proceeded to read. I thanked him for the attention
his Government had given to this matter and the
spirit seemingly prompting his Government to seek

"I then said that, having seen in the American press the purpose and nature of his contemplated call on me, I had requested the Far Eastern Division to jot down a list of instances of transgressions by Japanese or due to Japanese influence in China to the detriment and infury of Americans and of American interests. I added that this list of incidents had not been elaborated but that I would proceed to read them. I then read the memorandum prepared by the Far Eastern Division attached hereto and marked "A." The Ambassador appeared somewhat surprised and at a loss for further comment with regard to this paper. He said he would be pleased to have a copy of it. I replied that I would be glad to request the Far Eastern Division to put it in more elaborate form if possible and to send a copy to him at the Japanese

10 11 12

1

3

4

5

7

8

9

to clear it up.

14 15

13

16

17

18

20 21

22

23

Embassy.

"The Ambassador then said that, speaking personally, he might say his Government yesterday 1 had decided to abandon any further negotiations 2 with Germany and Italy relative to closer relations under the Anti-Comintern Pact to which they have been parties for some time. He added that the change in affairs in Europe made this course manifest, and, furthermore, it was plain that his Government would find it important to adopt new foreign policy in more or less respects. I might 10 say that he prefaced this general reference to his country by reiterating his personal desire to clear p any misunderstandings or differences between our 13 wo countries and to restore the friendly relations 14 heretofore existing." 15

Skipping to the bottom of the page:

"I then referred to his comment about Japan and her purpose to adopt a new foreign policy, and I made observations substantially as follows:

"The principles and practices of American policy in regard to the world in general and the Far East in particular are well known to all governments eyerywhere.

"During recent years Japanese authorities

25

24

Embassy.

"The Ambassador then said that, speaking personally, he might say his Government yesterday 1 had decided to abandon any further negotiations 2 with Germany and Italy relative to closer relations 3 under the Anti-Comintern Pact to which they have been parties for some time. He added that the change in affairs in Europe made this course manifest, and, furthermore, it was plain that his Government would find it important to adopt new foreign policy in more or less respects. I might say that he prefaced this general reference to his country by reiterating his personal desire to clear up any misunderstandings or differences between our 13 wo countries and to restore the friendly relations 14 heretofore existing." Skipping to the bottom of the page: 16 "I then referred to his comment about Japan 17 and her purpose to adopt a new foreign policy, and I made observations substantially as follows: "The principles and practices of American policy in regard to the world in general and the Far East in particular are well known to all governments eyerywhere. "During recent years Japanese authorities 24

and or agencies have been pursuing courses which come

into direct conflict with those principles and policies and which involve disregard of principles of international law and of treaties between the United States and Japan and also multilateral treaties to which the United States and Japan are parties.

"The United States had made representations over and over and over again in objection to or protest against overt acts of these types. The Japanese Government has given assurances over and over again that it has regard for the principles and the rules and the provisions involved and that it will show its regard for them — and over and over Japanese authorities have immediately committed other acts in disregard thereof.

Japanese authorities or of action by agencies thereof
hostile not only to occidental nationals and interests
in general, but to American nationals and interests in
particular. These courses of action by Japanese have
coresulted in arousing against Japan feelings of suspiction and attitudes of opposition on the part of
courses all of the other powers which have interests in
the Far East, especially in China, including the

1

2

3

4

5

10

11

12

13

"It should be evident to Japan that there is something wrong with policies and practices on the part of one nation which arouse antagonism on the part of almost all other nations in contact

with that nation.

"The United States wishes to have amicable relations with every other country in the world.

We have in the past had very friendly relations with every country in the Far East, including Japan. Our policy is a policy of 'Live and lot live.'

We seek nowhere any special position; but we seek everywhere equality of opportunity under conditions of fair treatment and security.

"The world is being given today new object lessions with regard to the futility of policies wherein nations plan to take advantage of other nations by use of armed force in disregard of moral principles and legal principles and generally accepted acioms of friendly and profitable general international intercourse.

"The future of American-Japanese relations lies largely in the hands of Japan. American policy is a policy of friendliness and fair dealing toward all nations. It will not change.

"The Ambassador seemed appreciative and

•

K p & W

6

7

12

13

15

I now offer in evidence defense document 710, the content of which was marked for identification as exhibit 2346, transcript page 17,836, to show that the HIRANUMA Cabinet resigned as a result of the German-Russian Treaty.

THE PRESIDENT: Brigadier Nolan.

BRIGADIER NOLAN: May it please the Tribunal, in the submission of the prosecution an important announcement of this kind should not be attempted to be placed in evidence through the medium of a newspaper article. Similar instances have arisen on a number of occasions and the Tribunal has, I think, almost always taken the position that when the matter is of importance it must be proved in the proper way.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Your Honor, I was under 16 the impression that it was the fact in which the Tribunal was interested, not in the manner of its 18 presentation. The form is immaterial whether it is by newspaper article, or whether it is by the spoken word, or whether it is by affidavit. Whether or not it is true is the question and I am only asking you to take it for whatever value it has.

THE PRESIDENT: We can never take the reasons for the resignation of a cabinet from the newspapers. I think this very point has arisen before and we

1 2

"(An article of the 'The Tokyo Asahi-Shimbun' on August 29th.)

3

5

6

7

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

19

20

22

23 24 "Since I took the helm of the government

upon receiving the Imperial Command, I, in cooperation with my cabinet members and in conformity with the Imperial wish, have been endeavouring to overcome the prevailing difficulties and establish a New Order in East Asia, whereby to attain the aim of the Holy War.

"Moreover, our diplomatic policy which followed the Imperial plan upon which Japan was founded and was established on the basis of morality, had mainly aimed at contributing to world peace and world culture. Following this principle our policies towards Europe have been formulated and reports thereof have frequently been made to the throne. As the recently concluded German-Soviet Non-Aggression Pact, however, gave rise to a new phase of complexity and grotesqueness in the situation of Europe, it became necessary for our country have in view the abandonment of the policies which have hitherto been prepared and to establish new policies. This means evidently nothing but a change of what I have repeatedly reported to the Throne, and this causes the Emperor's worry again; I am in sincere awe thinking

have made the same pronouncement. You see, it is a question of weight. If better evidence is available, and it ought to be, because I think at least one of the Members of the Cabinet is in the dock, we may take the view eventually as what appears in the press is not supported by those who know -if that be the case -- that the press report is of no value.

The attitude of my colleagues is that they are prepared to accept it as proof or some proof of the resignation of the cabinet, but not of the reasons for its resignation. The objection is overruled and the document admitted on the usual terms.

We were told that the document was marked for identification only and was not in evidence too. However, I understand it is not in fact in evidence.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 710 is now marked admitted into evidence and will receive exhibit No. 2728.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 2728 and received in evidence.) MR. CUNNINGHAM: (Reading) "Statement of Premier HIRANUMA

"On August 28, the 14th year of Showa

25

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

"(An article of the 'The Tokyo Asahi-Shimbun' on August 29th.)

"Since I took the helm of the government upon receiving the Imperial Command, I, in cooperation with my cabinet members and in conformity with the Imperial wish, have been endeavouring to overcome the prevailing difficulties and establish a New Order in East Asia, whereby to attain the aim of the Holy War.

"Moreover, our diplomatic policy which followed the Imperial plan upon which Japan was founded and was established on the basis of morality, had mainly aimed at contributing to world peace and world culture. Following this principle our policies towards Europe have been formulated and reports thereof have frequently been made to the throne. As the recently concluded German-Soviet Non-Aggression Pact, however, gave rise to a new phase of complexity and grotesqueness in the situation of Europe, it became necessary for our country have in view the abandonment of the policies which have hitherto been prepared and to establish new policies. This means evidently nothing but a change of what I have repeatedly reported to the Throne, and this causes the Emperor's worry again; I am in sincere awe thinking

4

1

2

6

7

9

10

12

13 14

15

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

Emperor by giving advice to him. As a Japanese subject, it is nothing less than becoming familiar with the Emperor and slighting his favour granted upon me to remain'longer in my present post.

Moreover, when we intend to tide over this critical situation into which our country is driven by arranging its organization and improving upon its diplomatic devices, it would be, I believe, of urgent necessity to effect conversion of the situation and to bring a renewal upon our minds. For these reasons this day I have reported to the Throne and in awe begged to be relieved of my post."

THE PRESIDENT: Seeing the limited extent to which it is admitted, we have not bothered to ask you for copies of what you read. We have not been served with any. Nevertheless, if you offer us copies, Mr. Cunningham, we won't refuse them.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Well, I probably misunderstood your intention and your probably misunderstood mine; I don't know. I will supply copies during the recess so that you will have them.

The second group of documents now to follow pertain to the period approximately from September 1939 to July 1940, when the cabinets of General ABE and Admiral YONAI followed consecutively the cabinet of HIRANUMA. It will be shown that no collaboration, not even a friendly relation, existed between Japan and Germany at that time; that the Japanese Government endeavored hard to come to an understanding with the Anglo-Saxon countries. However, lack of any reciprocating attitude on the part of the U.S.A. and the world situation at that time, war in Europe, doomed this policy to failure.

I first call the Court's attention to defense exhibit 2272, transcript page 16,240-16,242, KIDO's Diary of 28 August 1939, to show that the ABE Cabinet was born with the Imperial order to adopt a friendly

4 5

2

3

7

9

10

11

12

13 14

15 16

17 18

19 20

21 22

23 24

25

foreign policy to Great Britain and the United States. The Emperor instructed Premier ABE, upon bestowing Imperial Order to form a new Cabinet, that 'Diplomatic policy should follow the line of cooperation with Britain and the United States' (transcript page 16,241, Line 23 to 24). That is a prosecution exhibit.

I now offer in evidence defense document No. 246, a statement of ABE Cabinet, dated 4 September 1939, to show that the Japanese Government made clear by this statement; that it had abandoned the pro-Axis policy.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms. CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 246 will receive exhibit No. 2729.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit 2729 and received in evidence.)

MR. CUNNINGHAM (reading): "STATEMENT OF THE JAPANESE GOVERNMENT.

"September 4, 1939.

"In the face of the European war that has just broken out, Japan intends not to be involved therein: `she will concentrate her efforts on the settlement of the China Affair."

The next document is rather long, your Honor. THE PRESIDENT: We will recess for fifteen minutes. (Whereupon, at 1045, a recess was taken until 1100, after which the proceedings were resumed as follows:)

M r S e & S

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MARSHAL OF THE COUNT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed. THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Cunningham.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: For the benefit of the interpreters and so on, document No. 206-G hasn't arrived up through the processing yet and therefore I have to put it on later together with document 1635 and 1400 E-3. They will have to be deferred because all three deal with the same subject matter.

I now offer in evidence defense document 1400 D-3, a further excerpt from "Foreign helations of the United States" which is a telegram of Ambassador Grew to the Secretary of State, dated 18 December 1939, concerning a conversation between Ambassador Grew and Foreign Minister NOMURA on that date, to show that the Japanese Government decided to reopen a part of the Yangze hiver for navigation for the purpose of improving the Japanese-American relations. Foreign Minister NOMURA handed a memorandum to Ambassador Grew in which it was stated that, if the American Government did not reciprocete to this Japanese effort, Japanese-American relations would undergo a grave set back.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms. MR. CUNNINGHAM: I only propose to read point two on page three.

No. 1400 D-3 will receive exhibit No. 2730.

(%hereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 2730 and received in evidence.)

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I was cut off by the light -point two on page three, and starting "With special
reference" on page five down to the end. (Reading):

"2. The second point I should like to mention is the problem of navigation of the Yangtze River which has long been under consideration by the Japanese military. It is the intention of the military to open the lower reaches of the Yangtze hiver as far as Nanking. While military operations continue in that area, and opening of the river will cause various difficulties and inconveniences, it is possible gradually to moderate military requirements. Moreover, with the inauguration of the period for gradual building up of China, it is the intention of the military to open up a portion of China despite the military inconveniences which will have to be endured. However in dealing with the opening of the military (river) to navigation, consideration must be given to the need for consolidating various military establishments in that area and to the continued carrying on of

2

1

4

5

6

8

9

11

13

14

16

17 13

19

20

22

23 24

the banks of the river as far as Nanking, not to mention the upper reaches of the river; it therefore follows that there will be restrictions based upon military necessity. However, these restrictions should gradually be relaxed with the passage of time.

While it is desired to effect the opening of the river as early as possible in order to prevent any disturbances to the economic life of the area and to forestall any adverse effects upon the building up of the area, it is a matter (sic) anticipated, in the light of the preparation mentioned above and the necessity of consultation with various powers, that about two months will be required. The matter of the rearl River is also being considered along the above lines."

And then down to the opposite page -- page five. (Reading):

"With special reference to the questions of reopening the Yangtze River, the view is held in certain quarters that the Japanese forces having made enormous sacrifices to reopen the river after it had been closed by the Chinese, no obligation rests on the Japanese to throw the river open to all. Consequently, as above stated, if at a time when progress is being made toward the adjusting of pending questions and

3 4 5

concrete preparations are being made for the throwing open of the Yangtze River, no effective results are seen from the standpoint of improving international relations, the Government would be attacked by public opinion. In such contingency, adverse criticisms and attacks would certainly arise not only in connection with the reopening of the river but with the settlement of other pending questions, and difficulties would develop in putting such plans of settlement into effect. The result would be that relations between Japan and the United States, instead of improving would, it is feared, (tend toward the opposite direction and so proceed to a point which it would be difficult to estimate. I earnestly hope that Your Excellency will appreciate these considerations.)"

Then to the opposite page -- on the back page. (Reading):

"During our conversation on November 4, Your Excellency referred to mersures both negative and positive and I recall Your Excellency's observation that 'In my view it is possible to bring about a speedy reversal of public opinion in the United States and there is possibility of improvement in our relations if these measures can be taken immediately.' It is my expectation that the American Government will especially

24

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

13

19

20

21

22

23

appreciate the fact that the Imperial Government is overcoming innumerable difficulties and as above stated is exerting its utmost efforts with a view to opening the way for improvement in American-Japanese relations, end that the American Government will in the same spirit reciprocate the efforts being put forward on our side. It goes without saying that more than anythin else the termination of the treaty of Commerce and Navigation casts the darkest shadow over American-Japanese relations. There remains but a little more then one month before the treaty expires. On the occasion of our previous conversation I said I personally hope that if it is to be that the treaty must expire, commerce between the two countries may continue in a normal manner so that there may occur nothing which will cause the peoples of the two countries to be penalized. To meet this situation some means must be devised; formalities of various kinds must first be taken, but we cannot afford to postpone due to the time required for these formalities and nearly (other) related matters. I therefore believe that there is need for arranging to enter into negotiations before the Christmas holidays begin and request Your Excellency's consideration of this point." Signed "Grew."

I next offer in evidence defense document

24

1

3

4

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

No. 1400 C-3, an excerpt from "Foreign kelations of the United States, Japan 1931-1941," r telegram from Grew to Hull dated 20 December 1939, to show that the American Government was not ready to respond to the inidiative taken by the Japanese Foreign Minister as shown by the foregoing document.

5

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

THE PRESIDERT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document No.1400-Cwill receive exhibit No. 2731.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 2731

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Hull to Mr. Grew. MR. CUNNINGHAM: (Reading):

"The Secretary of State to the Ambassador in Japan (Grew) Washington, December 20, 1939 - 7 p.m." Skipping the rest of the formal parts.

"The Department has given careful study to
the telegrams under reference. The Department concurs
in your view that it would not be advisable in response
to the initiative taken by the Japanese Minister for
Foreign Affairs to return a categorical negative which
would serve to close the door to further discussions
and to discourage the afforts of the Japanese Governthat the same time we are not in position to

commit ourselves now to entering upon a negotiation. We are inclined to feel that the negotiation of a new treaty with the thought of holding ratification of such treaty in abeyance until the Japanese Government should have carried out certain assurances would be likely to produce more potentialities of misunderstanding and of disadvantages then would a treatyless condition. We are receiving numerous inquiries with regard to the effect which termination of the treaty will have upon relations between the United States and Japan. those inquiries we ere replying that the absence of a commercial treaty does not of itself cause an interruption in commercial relations; that in such circumstances those relations are governed in each country by its municipal law or practice, subject, of course, to any applicable principles of international law; that in the opinion of the Department the expiration of the tresty of 1911 with Japan will not produce of itself eny change in the general customs duties or treatment applicable to imports of Japanese goods into the United States; and that, similarly, there does not appear reason to expect that the termination of the treaty will produce of itself any marked changes in the general customs duties or treatment applicable in Japan to imports from the United States.

3 4 5

1

2

6

9

8

11

13

14

16 17

18

19

21

22

23

24

"With regard to the proposal made by the Minister for Foreign Affairs that a modus vivendi be entered into, we prefer to leave our attitude toward that proposal open for the time being. We shall give the matter consideration but wish you to know that our tentative thought is that any modus vivendi which might upon further study commend itself to us under existing circumstances would have to be of a very limited scope to relate principally to rights of establishment and not of trade, and to be of a character which would leave this Government free to impose restrictions upon trade in case developments should make such course appear necessary toward better safeguerding American interests.

"The Department is hoping to be able to send you tomorrow in continuation of the above a suggested text of a statement which we feel you might helpfully make orally to the Minister for Foreign Affairs."

Signed "Hull."

I now offer in evidence defense document No. 1631, an official document of the Japanese Foreign Office, minutes of conversation between NOMURA and Grew on 22 December 1939, to show that the United States of America did not reciprocate to the aforementioned

 States relations, and turned down the Japanese proposal

to conclude at least a modus vivendi in case of expiration of the Commercial Treaty, thus placing the Japanese Government in a very difficult position in face of growing public irritation in Japan. I shall not read the appendices.

Japanese endeavours for improving the Japanese-United

THE PARSIDEAT: Admitted on the usual terms. CLEAK OF THE COUNT: Defense document No.1631, will receive exhibit No. 2732.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked derense exhibit No. 2732 and received in evidence.)

Mh. CUNNINGHAM: (Reading):

"The Fourth Conversation in Tokyo Concerning the Question of Concluding a New Treaty of Commerce. (At the official residence of the Minister, about one hour from 5:30 p.m., 22 December 1939.)

"First of all Ambassador Grew stating that he appreciated the efforts on the part of Japan for the improvement of Japanese-American relations, and that, as to the proposal made by Japan during the last conversation, the United States Government had prepared a statement clarifying its standpoint for the information of the Japanese Government, handed over an unofficial

7

8

9 10

11

12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

document as attached hereto (see Appendix A) to Minister 6 11 14

NOMURA. This statement points out that the American Government considers the principle of equality of commercial rights and opportunity to be the fundamental condition for concluding a new commercial treaty, and that the establishment of such a principle is a prerequisite to the conclusion of a commercial treaty. In this connection the statement declares not only the policies and practices of the other party, but also the treatment of Americans in third countries under its influence are called into question, and as at present there exist in territories under Japanese occupation various restrictions on commerce, residence, travel, etc., rendering imperative the practice of equality of treatment for American commercial rights and interests, this constituted an obstacle to the conclusion of a new treaty."

THE PRESIDENT: Rendering inoperative.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Well, as corrected. Did you say inoperative or impossible?

THE PRESIDENT: Inoperative.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: (Reading):

"Regarding the statement, the Ambassador added that he hoped various assurances given to the United States by former Foreign Ministers would be carried into

3

10

12

13

15

16

17

13

19

20 21

22

23 24

effect. Then the Ambrssador stated that as regards the conclusion of a provisional modus vivendi the American Government proposed that the question be left open for the time being, and that according to the views of the American Government it would be appropriate to continue the discussions which had been going on between Minister NOMUNA and Ambassador Grew concerning various questions to be considered in connection with the conclusion of a new commercial treaty or agreement (see Appendix B). The Ambassador stated further that with regard to the 10% ad valorem duties to be imposed as provided by the Tariff Act of 1913, on goods carried by Japanese ships which enter United States ports, the Treasury Department would soon instruct the customs collectors not to collect such duties until further orders had been issued, and as to the levying of discriminatory tonnage dues on Japanese ships, the Department of Commerce would adopt similar measures (see Appendix C).

"In reply to this, Minister NOMURA said that although he appreciated the measure which the United States was going to take to keep Japanese-American trade in a normal condition in spite of the expiration of the treaty, a commercial treaty is not only concerned with foreign trade but also has a bearing on general relations;

1 2 3

6

8

9

7

10

12

14

15

17

18

21

20

22

24

that from the viewpoint of stabilizing the relations between the two countries he desired the United States to reconsider the question of the conclusion of a provisional modus vivendi. As Ambassador Grew asked for an unofficial document, saying that he wished to transmit this correctly to his home government, the document as shown in appendix D was sent to him afterwards.

"Then upon Minister NOMURA's question as to the American attitude towards the "right of establishment," Ambassador Grew replied that he was not in a position to enswer the question.

"Lestly, Ambassador Grew referred to the recent conversations between YOSHIZAWA and Dorman and, after saying that ashington knew of the fact that Japan had prepared a draft of a modus vivendi, promised to report the results of the conversation to his home Government.

"As for the question of the press release,
Ambassador Grew expressed his wish to publish only to
the effect that the conversation had been continued with
a constructive attitude for the improvement of JapaneseAmerican relations and that some progress had been
achieved, and to refrain from publishing the matter
concerning the 10% ad valorem duties, tonnage dues, etc.,
to which minister NOMURA agreed."

22

4

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

24

I now offer in evidence defense document 259, Address of Prime Minister of the new Cabinet, Admiral YONAI, at the 75th Session of the Japanese Diet on 1 February 1940, to show that the YONAI Cabinet also adopted the same foreign policy as the ABE Cabinet of non-intervention in the European war.

THE PRESIDENT: Brigadier Nolan.

BRIGADIER NOLAN: May it please the Tribunal, this document, No. 259, was offered in evidence before this Tribunal and rejected at page 21,817 of the record. The basis of the objection was that the document was full of political platitudes and had no probative value. For the most part it sets out the course of action which, according to the speech, Japan intends to follow. On occasions the Tribunal has admitted speeches made by prime ministers and foreign ministers, but on every occasion the test has been the probative value of the document itself, and on this occasion I submit that there is none.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Your Honors, I forgot to mention that only the statement on the bottom of page 2 is all that relates to this matter and that is all I expect to read.

THE PRESIDENT: What do you mean by the statement at the bottom of page 2? The whole of the

I now offer in evidence defense document 259, Address of Prime Minister of the new Cabinet, Admiral YONAI, at the 75th Session of the Japanese Diet on 1 February 1940, to show that the YONAI Cabinet also adopted the same foreign policy as the ABE Cabinet of non-intervention in the European war.

THE PRESIDENT: Brigadier Nolan.

BRIGADIER NOLAN: May it please the Tribunal, this document, No. 259, was offered in evidence before this Tribunal and rejected at page 21,817 of the record. The basis of the objection was that the document was full of political platitudes and had no probative value. For the most part it sets out the course of action which, according to the speech, Japan intends to follow. On occasions the Tribunal has admitted speeches made by prime ministers and foreign ministers, but on every occasion the test has been the probative value of the document itself, and on this occasion I submit that there is none.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Your Honors, I forgot to mention that only the statement on the bottom of page 2 is all that relates to this matter and that is all I expect to read.

THE PRESIDENT: What do you mean by the statement at the bottom of page 2? The whole of the

paragraph --

MR. CUNNINGHAM: That whole paragraph on the bottom of page 2. Oh. Perhaps you have a different copy than I have.

THE PRESIDENT: Do you object to that part, Brigadier?

BRIGADIER NOLAN: May it please the Tribunal, I do object because it so well expresses the point of view that I have been endeavoring to put to the Tribunal, that it is merely a declaration of intention to do something, and, in our submission, the Tribunal is concerned only with what was, in fact, done.

THE PRESIDENT: We have been more liberal in dealing with speeches by one of the accused.

By a majority the objection is upheld and the document rejected.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I now offer in evidence
Defense document 1645, an official document of the
Japanese Foreign Office, which is the protest of the
Japanese Government to the British Government on the
Asama-Maru Incident, dated 13 January 1940, to show
that Great Britain took German passengers from the
Japanese liner Asama-Maru returning from the United
States of America to Japan in the waters near Tokyo
Bay, in violation of the international law, and evoked

1 2

7 8

strong protest from Japan, creating bad will and virtually committing an act of war.

THE PRESIDENT: Brigadier Nolan.

BRIGADIER NOLAN: May it please the Tribunal, this is another statement by a foreign office spokesman, the majority of which have been rejected by the Tribunal. These statements which are produced in English are merely prepared for consumption at home and abroad through the medium of the domestic and foreign press. We submit that this is not the proper method in which to prove the facts of this alleged incident.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I submit, your Honor, that there is no opinion or anything else in this document. It is a mere statement of the Japanese Government in protest and this is the usual manner in which public protests are made in international relations, and I do not see how we could better the evidence than to give the official protest issued by the Japanese Government through their official spokesman.

THE PRESIDENT: How is it relevant?

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Well, if your Honor please, the prosecution has made great weight of the Ladybird and the Panay as acts of war and as overt acts, and certainly there are reciprocating provocations which

7 8

cause international rift and disruption of relations, and this is an off-setting incident which is of the same nature as the Ladybird and the Panay.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority, the objection is upheld and the document rejected.

W h 1 n & D u

1

2

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

13

19

20

21

22

23

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I now offer in evidence defense document No. 1452 and No. 221, official documents of the Japanese Foreign Office which are the explanations of the Asama Maru Incident by Foreign Minister ARITA in the 70th Session of the Diet on the 1st and 6th of February, 1940, to show the strong public indignation in Japan caused by the Asama Maru Incident, giving stimulus to the anti-British feelings in Japan.

THE PRESIDENT: Brigadier Nolan.

BRIGADIER NOLAN: If it please the Tribunal, the prosecution objects to the two documents just referred to, No. 1452 and No. 221. If this were the result of an investigation or if it were a report by someone authorized to make a report, it would be in a very different position. But here we find a speech delivered by a parliamentarian in the Diet, giving his views and opinions on what will be a deterioration in the feelings of the Japanese people towards Great Britain.

In addition, it deals with a matter which has not been raised by the prosecution in this case, and is an incident that bears no relationship and has no similarity with the incidents of the Ladybird and the Panay.

24

1 2

5

6

7

9

10

12

13 14

15 16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24 25 The prosecution submits that the documents should be rejected.

THE RESIDENT: Mr. Cunningham.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: If your Honors please, the objection seems to have several defects, but the first is that I don't know anyone who could speak more authoritatively on the Japanese position than the Minister ARITA at the time.

On the second proposition, it is misunderstandings between nations which causes wars and certainly the mere fact that the prosecution did not raise this question does not preclude us from setting it up as a mitigating circumstance or as an affirmative defense.

On the third proposition, it does not require shooting to bring about alienation of affection in international feeling.

THE PRESILENT: It seems to me to be covered by the decision on the previous document, Mr. Cunningham; but my colleagues may think otherwise.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Well, I understood that the objection on the other was the defect in the certification or the source of the document; but there certainly could be no objection to the source of this information.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority, the objection is upheld and the document rejected.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I now call the Court's attention to prosecution exhibits 1285, 1286 and 1287, transcript pages 11,675 to 11,680, concerning Foreign Minister ARITA's statement on the status of the Netherlands East Indies and subsequent exchange of opinions with Holland, Britain, France and America, between 13 and 16 May 1941, which show conclusively that the Japanese policy of maintaining and respecting the status quo of the N.E.I. was fully approved by the said countries.

I only propose to read the first paragraph and other marked parts -- to refer to parts that were not read by the prosecution. No -- I don't propose to read any of the document, just call attention to it.

I now call the Court's attention to prosecution exhibits 517 and 518, transcript pages 6157 to 6160, telegrams exchanged between Ribbentrop and Ott on 22 and 23 May 1940, which show conclusively that with respect to ARITA's statement on the status of the Netherlands East Indies, Germany âid not express her attitude until specifically asked by Japan, her answer arrived later than that of other governments, and that Germany âid not commit anything in favor of Japan.

1 2

3

4 5

9

11

13

14

15 16

17

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

This shows that no collaboration did possibly exist between Japan and Germany at that time.

I do not propose to read any of it, just refer to it.

I next call the Court's attention to prosecution exhibit No. 521, transcript pages 6166 to 6168, memorandum signed by Wiehl, director of the Economic Department of the German Foreign Office, dated 20 June 1940, which shows that Germany was dissatisfied with Japan's attitude with respect to the economic relations with Germany and was not favorably disposed to Japan's request concerning the French Indo-China question.

I now offer in eviedence defense document No. 1636, a telegram from Ambassador Mackensen in Rome to the German Foreign Office, dated 27 May 1940, to show that the visit of Ambassador SATO to Berlin in June of 1940 was only unofficial and incidental and no official mission was given to this visit.

This document is presented in rebuttal of prosecution's exhibits No. 524, 525 and 526, 1020 and 1021, concerning conversation, SATO to Ribbentrop.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms. CLERK OF THE COURT: Lefense document 1636 will received exhibit No. 2733.

(Whereupon, the document above

8

10

12

7 8

referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 2733 and received in evidence.)

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Omitting the formal parts:

"Ambassador SATO told me on his visit of today, that he would accept gladly the invitation of the German Government with four accompanists of the Japanese Foreign Office and director and other representatives of the Manchurian Aircraft Company -- name will subsequently sent by letter -- and come to Germany after the conclusion of the trip in Italy, with the polite reservation that if the development of the near future with respect to the difficulties of his homeward travel should not compel him to change his plans.

"(SATO said that) He can come to Germany only as a private man, because his highly official mission in Italy in response to the equally highly official Italian mission in Japan will find the end in Venice. He asks therefore not to make in Germany any official reception with company of honour and similar things. My suggestion to place from the German side some accompanists at his disposal he took up with thanks. We agreed that he will be treated as Etranger de distinction (foreigner of distinction).

"Departure will not be before 14 June, because SATO will probably go back from Venice to Rome for the

2 3 4

in Germany will be from 5 to 7 days. SATO repeated the wish to make acquaintance with the German Foreign Minister and to see the Secretary of State Weiszacker, whom he knew from Geneve, but he emphasized that he has full understanding, if the German Foreign Minister could not receive him under the present circumstances. He will be thankful if he could make some sightseeings, but he will leave everything to the discretion of the German Government.

"Director of the Manchurian Aircraft Company, who will accompany SATO, is already in direct contact with the corresponding German authorities.

"SATO, who leaves Rome on 28 May, can be reached through me and the Japanese Embassy here."

Signed "Mackensen."

I now call the Court's attention to prosecution' exhibits No. 525, 526 and 1020, transcript pages 6186 to 6190, and transcript pages 9694 to 9703, telegrams exchanged between Ambassador SATO and Foreign Minister ARITA on the conversation of the former with Ribbentrop on 9 July 1940, which show that no results were obtained by this conversation. No collaboration between Japan and Germany.

I want to read page 4 of exhibit 1020.

Have you the documents?

THE PRESIDENT: Yes, we have them. Thank you.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: (Reading) "As you will

understand from what I report with this cable, I

could not find any definite attitude on German side
as shown by Italian premier regarding Lutch East Indies
and French Indo-China. It is also a great regret that
I could not get any promises or pledges and on the

contrary it was observed that German side rather avoided
to give definite previous promises to these problems.
As there was a wish from the German side, I hope you
would pay attention not to have the contents of this
telegram be leaked outside.

"Cabled the same to Italy, the United States, Soviet Union and Britain."

1 2 2

I now call the Court's attention to the prosecution's exhibit No. 545, transcript page 6285 to 6292, outline of conversations between MATSUOKA and Ott, dated 1 August 1940, and read the part which was not read by the prosecution to show that Ott was very much dissatisfied with the unfriendly treatment he received from the Japanese Foreign Office. Again no collaboration between Japan and Germany.

I will read page 4 (last paragraph) and 5.

Read in the light of the evidence of Zorge
influence and other evidence offered, Ott's situation
would be more understandable.

Page 5:

"And Ambassador Ott said 'Since I have arrived here as Ambassador to Japan, what I had felt has been entirely unpleasant. Until now KASUMI-GASEKI has disregarded Germany and never given settlements to the question German Embassy had turned over. For some of them, even a reply has not been given. This may be sufficient reason to be called back home by my government. And you have never given me the chance to see you except on business and I have been treated inferior to British and the United States Ambassadors: I take this for an unendurable insult. In spite of such conditions the German Government has

still a little hope in me and has not called me back home till today."

The following third group of witnesses and documents will show that the motives of the Japanese Government in concluding the Tripartite Pact on 27 September 1940, and the purpose of that Pact as interpreted by the Japanese Government, were peaceful and purely defensive, and Germany also assured Japan of her peaceful intention during the negotiations for the Pact. It will further be shown that the Tripartite Pact is entirely different from the abortive treaty negotiated in 1938 and 1939 by the HIRANUMA Cabinet. These in rebuttal of the prosecution's charge that the Pact was concluded as a means of dominating the world by Japan, Germany and Italy, and that the Pact was the final stage of the continuous collaboration between the three countries since 1936.

I first call witness Heinrich Stahmer, the former ambassador of Germany to Japan, who could be considered as one of the best living authorities on Japanese-German relations. As Mr. Stahmer will go back to Germany soon and will not be able to be a witness in the Individual Phase, I wish, with the Court's permission, to ask him also questions pertaining to another matter that probably shouldn't be mentioned now.

I call Witness Stahmer who is in my office.

MR. TAVENNER: If the Tribunal please, we have not received a copy of the affidavit. It has not been served on the prosecution.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, if we adjourn now you will have an opportunity to peruse it before the afternoon. Will that be satisfactory?

MR. TAVENNER: If your Honor please, this is an affidavit I think we should have the rule complied with, the twenty-four hour rule.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Well, your Honor, the affidavit has been completed for three, four, five or six days, and it is just the fault of the machinery and not my fault.

THE PRESIDENT: Still the rule must be complied with. It was applied as against the prosecution.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: May I suggest, your Honor, that this witness speaks perfect English. There is no reason why he shouldn't testify in English. There is no reason why he should have an affidavit except for convenience purposes.

THE PRESIDENT: The Judges like to have an advance copy of the proposed evidence, too. We were served in time.

The marshal assures me that he doesn't know

8 9

the German form of oath which you promised him, Mr. Cunningham.

MA. CUNNINGHAM: I miscalculated five minutes.

I expected to get him that in the noon hour.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, we can't take this witness' evidence before tomorrow.

Mr. Comyns Carr.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Well, now, your Honor, the order of proof is all made up, and certainly it appears to me that we shouldn't put a stop watch on this matter just for technical reasons. I can't go on with my proof very well under the circumstances because these documents have been processed and published, and it is certainly a detail as far as I am concerned.

THE PRESIDENT: We can't give you a privilege not extended to others, Mr. Cunningham. All counsel are equal before us.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Well, does your Honor wish to postpone this matter, the whole process, until twenty-four hours has expired?

This witness should not have to testify by affidavit at all. It is only a matter of convenience. He is an English-speaking witness and he is exempted from the affidavit rule.

THE PRESIDENT: I have had the advantage of a

1

5

8

9

10 11

12 13

14

15 16

17

19

20

18

21

22

24

discussion with all my colleagues on this matter, and they would like to know in advance what evidence is to be given, and, of course, therefore, the affidavit rule must be applied. In its terms it does not distinguish between English-speaking witnesses and others.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Your Honor, I understood your discussion with Mr. Logan in chambers specifically excepted English-speaking witnesses and European witnesses, if my memory is correct.

THE PRESIDENT: That is so. Subsequently I discussed the matter with my colleagues who prefer to know in advance what the witness is going to say.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Well, I don't want to be technical about it, and I don't want to delay the process any. I would like to have this witness testify first, and I have about 150 or 200 questions to ask him in addition to his affidavit.

But still in order that his testimony will be continuous and logical and so on, I will call my second witness who was supposed to come after Mr. Stahmer, Mr. SAITO.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Tavenner.

MR. TAVENNER: If the Tribunal please, I would like to offer a protest now to counsel's declared intention of interrogating the witness to the extent of one

discussion with all my colleagues on this matter, and they would like to know in advance what evidence is to be given, and, of course, therefore, the affidavit rule must be applied. In its terms it does not distinguish between English-speaking witnesses and others.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Your Honor, I understood your discussion with Mr. Logan in chambers specifically excepted English-speaking witnesses and European witnesses, if my memory is correct.

THE PRESIDENT: That is so. Subsequently I discussed the matter with my colleagues who prefer to know in advance what the witness is going to say.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Well, I don't want to be technical about it, and I don't want to delay the process any. I would like to have this witness testify first, and I have about 150 or 200 questions to ask him in addition to his affidavit.

But still in order that his testimony will be continuous and logical and so on, I will call my second witness who was supposed to come after Mr. Stahmer, Mr. SAITO.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Tavenner.

MR. TAVENNER: If the Tribunal please, I would like to offer a protest now to counsel's declared intention of interrogating the witness to the extent of one

hundred and some questions.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, my colleagues are insistent that the rule must be complied with, so that we cannot take the evidence today of this witness.

And they are all against, including myself, extensive questioning in addition to the affidavit. Where, say, through some inadvertence the affidavit isn't as full as it might be, then we may allow a question or two in addition, and, indeed, we have done so.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Well, your Honor please, the testimony of the witness does not lend itself to affidavit form, and, therefore, I have prepared the questions and answers written for the witness and all he has to do is read them, if necessary, which I think is highly improper, but as I have the questions and answers all written cut and processed that he can read after he gets through with his affidavit, the questions and answers follow logically after the affidavit. But I couldn't--

THE PRESIDENT: Which completely disposes of the rule against leading questions in the court itself.

You needn't say anything more, Mr. Tavenner.
You are only wasting time. We are determined that the rule shall be observed.

We will adjourn until half past one.

1 2

AFTERNOON SESSION

G 2

r 3 e 4 n b 5

L 9 f 10 e 11

13 14

12

15 16

18 19

17

20 21

22

23

24

The Tribunal met, pursuant to recess, at 1330.

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International

Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Cunningham.

MR. CUMNINGHAM: If the Tribunal please, I wish to state that the change in the order of witnesses totally disrupts the order of proof. The reason the affidavit was not distributed in English is because there is a rule downstairs that the prosecution will not receive the English copy until the Japanese copy is ready for distribution, and the English copies have been ready for a week. I just state that because it looks like a ridiculous situation.

is certainly misinformed about the rule that he spoke of. Since early in the first week of the defense phase, I gave positive instructions never to hold up delivery because of the absence of Japanese copy. I have checked on that numerous times, and I have never found an instance in which that has been done so far.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I do not propose to make an issue of it. I merely asked why it was not distributed when they had it so long, and they told me that the

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

12

13

15

16 17

18

20 21

23

22

24

reason it was not distributed was that the Japanese translation was not complete for distribution, and I specifically had to go to the prosecution document section to get a waiver of that rule in order to get a few documents beforehand.

I would like to call now a witness, SAITO, Ryoei, Advisor to Foreign Minister MATSUOKA at the time of the conclusion of the Tri-Partite Pact, affidavit No. 1592.

R Y O E I S A I T O, called as a witness on behalf of the defense, being first duly sworn, testified through Japanese interpreters as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. CUI.NINGHAM:

Q Will you state your name and your address, please?

A My name is SAITO, Ryoei, and my address is Tokyo, Shibuya-ku, Shoto No. 42.

Q I ask the Marshal to hand you the document marked defense document 1592, and I ask you if that is your affidavit?

(Whereupon, a document was handed to the witness.)

A There is no doubt it is my affidavit.

Q Are the statements contained therein true and correct as you verily believe?

A I believe the contents are accurate and truthful.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I offer in evidence defense document No. 1592, the affidavit of SAITO.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Tavenner.

MR. TAVENNER: If the Tribunal please, objection is made to the introduction of this affidavit in its entirety. The Tribunal may recall the defense document 1113, which was rejected at page 22,555, consisting of twenty-eight pages of argument, which the Tribunal rejected in entirety.

This affidavit, of course, relates to a different subject matter, but it is open to the same general objections. This is a statement of opinions and conclusions of the witness; and, to the extent that it expresses conclusions of his or MATSUOKA's, it is invading the province of the Tribunal. It is an outstanding example of prolixity and argument which the Tribunal has consistently criticized and upon which it has acted in disallowing evidence of this type.

More specifically, paragraph 2 on page 2 is a statement of the witness' conception of MATSUOKA's general idea regarding peace of the world, which seems

to be based on alleged conversations with MATSUOKA when he was President of the South Manchurian Railway Company.

Paragraph 3, on page 3, attempts to express
MATSUOKA's motives in deciding to conclude the TriPartite Pact. These expressions of the witness' views
of the motive of MATSUOKA, we think, are inadmissible.

Paragraph 4, on page 4, is a statement of the witness of what MATSUOKA considered and the witness' version of MATSUOKA's ideals, opinions, and thoughts. It is followed by a statement of what MATSUOKA did not tell the witness and a statement of what MATSUOKA, in the witness' opinion, did not intend to do.

Paragraph five on page six is a recital of the witness' opinion as to Japanese motives and what Japan thought which, we submit, is clearly an invasion of the province of the Tribunal.

In the paragraph on the top of page 7 an order relating to the China Incident is referred to, the absence of which is neither explained nor accounted for.

On page 8 is an argument by the witness based on the witness' consideration of what MATSUOKA thought about American intervention.

Paragraph numbered 6, beginning at the bottom of page 8 and extending through page 10, is an argument relating to encirclement, and it is called "Shaking Hands with Some Powers."

Paragraph seven on page 11 is a statement by the witness as to what MATSOUKA thought of Japan shaking hands with the USSR, based on another alleged conversation with MATSUOKA when he was President of the South Manchurian Railway Company.

The witness' statement contained in the paragraph at the top of page 12 is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue and, even if true, proves nothing.

Paragraph eight begins with the statement

that the Tri-Partite Pact was not concluded in preparation for war. This, we submit, is a conclusion which invades the province of this Tribunal. As to alleged reservations which are mentioned in this paragraph marked 8, the treaty and the exchange of letters is the best evidence. Reference is also made to a personal message from Ribbentrop which does not afford anything new as far as the issues: in this case are concerned, but the absence of it has neither been explained nor accounted for.

In item 9, paragraph No. 9, beginning near the bottom of page 15, we find a recital of what happened at a certain cabinet meeting. We contend that the minutes of the cabinet meeting constitute the best evidence and should be produced for whatever value they have.

Item 10 relates to certain alleged statements that MATSUOKA made on his trip to Germany.

I am in error in that appearing in that particular
paragraph. But, at any rate, the records of the
particular conference were kept and the minutes of
that conference are the best evidence.

THE PRESIDENT: If MATSUOKA were alive and went into the box to give evidence, would you object to these statements attributed to him in the affi-

davit here. We cannot talk of the evidence being given by the individual because the individual is dead. If the affidavit were confined to a statement of what MATSUOKA would have said, would you object? We certainly cannot have this witness' conclusions.

MR. TAVENNER: In most of the instances, if the Tribunal please, in which I have objected to the statements of the witness, they were his conclusions based upon alleged conversations that he had with MATSUOKA at some earlier date.

THE PRESIDENT: If the affidavit is limited to what MATSUOKA said, would you object?

MR. TAVENNER: I do not think that we could object to what he said at the time the negotiations were going on. But, as to what was said when he was President of the South Manchurian Railway Company, quite some years before the incidents involved, they are tied together in a rather ingenious way with the statements of the witness relating to conditions at the time of the negotiation for the pact; and, just as the former affidavit, it is impossible to go through this affidavit and determine with any satisfaction that which is not opinion and conclusions. It invades the province of the Tribunal and constitutes, also, opinion testimony. For that reason, we

object to the introduction of this affidavit in its entirety.

3

4

5

6

7

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23 24

25

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Cunningham.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: If your Honor please, as a matter of time and a matter of necessity, it is impossible to revise this affidavit to meet certain requirements that we do not know about now but which might be suggested by the prosecution. We have done our best to comply with the Court on this affidavit. This man was the legal adviser to Mr. MATSUOKA when he wrote the Tri-Partite Pact, and I believe that all the considerations which went into that Tri-Partite Pact were known by this man. There is nothing to prevent the Tribunal from eliminating from its consideration the opinions and conclusions as they did in the prosecution's case with the affidavits prepared by Mr. Helm which were purely legal arguments -- by Mr. Darcy.

Spratt & Yelde

THE PRESIDENT: But this inclusion in affidavits of opinions comes many months after the Court has warned against it. The prosecution as far as I recollect did not disregard any warning we gave but we have given this warning repeatedly.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I firmly state, your Honor, that this was not done in any disregard. It was done on account of the physical impossibility with the language difficulty to do any better job, and I don't' know how I could do it any better. I have no facilities in Japanese and I only rely on the Japanese counsel to understand the rulings of the Tribunal and to prepare the documents accordingly; and once the document is prepared, I feel certain, your Honors, that it would be much simpler if your Honors would disregard the opinions and the conclusions. It is not physically possible for me to revise this and go on with my proof.

THE PRESIDENT: Japanese counsel appear to us to be able, scholarly men in most cases and they should understand a simple direction of the Court that we will not allow these opinions to be inserted in affidavits.

MR. CUMNINGHAM: I submit, your Honors, that in our judgment they may be on the border line but they are not conclusions. They are statements of facts

supported by substantial evidence, supported by the record. They are the best statements of fact that we are able to give you and certainly--

THE PRESIDENT: We cannot allow them to assume our function of drawing conclusions. The witnesses tell us the facts; we draw the conclusions.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Your Honor, it is not physically possible now to comply with that sort of regulation, and what Mr. MATSUOKA said, whether it was a conclusion or a supported fact, it is significant and important. I can't go on with my proof if the affidavit is rejected. It just makes it necessary to postpone the case until we get this witness' affidavit in form. I can't get out of court and do things like that.

THE PRESIDENT: What are we to do with the defense, conducted by able lawyers, if they repeatedly disregard our rulings and if, as a result of our insisting upon our rulings being given effect to, the defense case is brought to a standstill? By repeatedly doing that they could prevent this Court, if this Court were foolish enough to allow them to do so, from ever reaching a verdict. This ruling which has been disregarded for months by able lawyers is a simple one, clearly understood by all, and must be observed. If

not we may have to close the case and come to a verdict.

We want to hear all the individual accused; we want to hear every bit of relevant and material evidence that you have to offer, but we want the case conducted in accordance with our clear, simple rules about the meaning of which nobody is under any misapprehension -- nobody, including the defense counsel.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: If your Honor please, I have four observations to make upon that which bear right on the point. The first is that it is a physical impossibility to comply with that technical rule with all the resourcefulness and legal ingenuity and ability and education that is at the defense command, especially on this document.

THE PRESIDENT: But you asked the Court to apply the rule by editing the affidavit.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: On the second point, your Honor, if I may go to my second point, I consider the exclusion of these points in this affidavit as the application of very technical rules of evidence which it is very, very difficult, if not impossible, to comply with.

THE PRESIDENT: The exclusion of opinions and conclusions which the Court alone is at liberty

1 2

to draw is not a technical matter. These witnesses with the collusion of Japanese counsel, so you say, are forming conclusions that we must draw. American counsel see these affidavits with the objectionable conclusions and they do not strike them out but they bring them to us.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: On the third proposition, your Honor, as far as being under a misapprehension, I understand perfectly the rule that you are trying to apply, and I have read this affidavit and I have put behind it my best judgment that I can give and I have received the judgment from some of my co-counsel who are working on it and this is the best we can do under the circumstances.

THE PRESIDENT: I think the position is well expressed in a note to me from one of the Members of the Court while I have been discussing the question with you: We should reject the document in its present form. The Tribunal cannot undertake to edit this document so far as excerpting from it (1) the irrelevant, (2) the immaterial, (3) the expressions of opinion, (4) the passages in which the witness swears the issue. That is undertaking our task.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: If your Honor please, if eleven Members of the Court cannot edit the document and eliminate from it the things by hearing it and reading it, how can you conceivably ask me or another counsel to read it and pass our judgment upon it? We must do our best, and that is all I can do.

in my experience we have counsel tendering documents which they know cannot be admitted according to the rules we have adopted and asking us to edit them. This is not a case where the admissibility of the particular evidence is in question. No question arises. The evidence is clearly inadmissible, and everybody knows it; and yet we are asked to edit the document. We are to make ourselves servants of the parties in the case instead of acting as judges.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: My colleagues decide that we ought to stand the witness down. Your Honors, I have done my best with the affidavit, and I hate to have to turn it over to somebody. You must realize it is impossible to present the documents in court and also edit them. I just do not have that kind of time or energy.

THE PRESIDENT: The counsel responsible for

3

4

)

8

9

10 11

12

14

16

18

19

20

21

22

24

these documents are serving their clients badly. It is a hard thing to say about counsel, but the observation is called for.

Mr. Tavenner.

MR. TAVENNER: If your Honor please, due to the importance of this principle, may I be permitted to make an observation.

There is a persistent rumor that it will take probably a year yet to complete this case. That rumor eminates from defense sources. We have been told that there would be hundreds of witnesses. Now it would seem to the prosecution that it should be a comparatively simple matter that affidavits should be perused and edited before they are processed. If we are required to make this type of objection after the processing of documents over the many months that it seems this case may still last, it will prolong this trial many months.

THE PRESIDENT: I make no charges. I voice no suspicions, but if the defense wanted to prevent us from ever reaching a verdict this would be the way to do it.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Well, your Honor, on the matter of time, it seems to me that if we read this affidavit and got it out of the way, an

hour and a half reading it, and got this witness away, it would certainly save time and not lose it. That is the way I look at it.

I ask that the witness be stood down and we will redraft the affidavit.

THE PRESIDENT: The witness is stood down.

(Whereupon, the witness was excused.)

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I would like to refer at this stage to defense document 1664, the affidavit of Admiral OIKAWA, Koshiro, former Minister of the Navy. Although Admiral OIKAWA will be on the witness stand at the later stage of this Pacific phase of the case, item 2 of his affidavit concerns the Tri-Partite Pact, in which he says that the purpose of the pact was to prevent the United States from entering the European War and thereby to stop the devastations of the war from spreading throughout the world. I should like only to read this one paragraph instead of calling the witness here for this purpose at this time because the rest of his testimony is disconnected with this particular item.

MR. TAVENNER: I may say, your Honor, that

that one paragraph is three or three and a half pages long, probably more than half of the affidavit.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I just want to avoid calling the witness two times or three times to get this one item, and I offer for identification defense document 1664 and only offer to read the one paragraph, item No. 2.

MR. TAVENNER: May I be heard. THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Tavenner.

MR. TAVENNER: This affidavit, or that half of it, will be presented during a subsequent phase of the case, and it is now requested that we cross-examine at that stage, which is probably the most feasible thing to do, but we think that the affidavit in its entirety should be admitted at that time rather than dividing it, and for that reason we object to the splitting of the document at this time.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I submit, your Honors, now is the most orderly time to hear the evidence on this particular question, and I should like to have this part of it into the record now and cross-examination can happen later. I might suggest that one of the reasons I want to do this

now is that I am not going to be here at the time Admiral OIKAWA is on the stand, and I should like to complete my presentation while I am here.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I am afraid, Mr.
Cunningham, the Tribunal is against you on splitting
the evidence in this way.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Well, your Honors, several of the counsel wished to have the Navy's view of the Tri-Partite Pact presented at the time the evidence on the interpretation of the Tri-Partite Pact was offered, and that is the reason why I am now asking that it be received.

THE PRESIDENT: We will allow you the same concession, necessarily, as we allowed in the case of other witnesses. You may call this man on this particular phase, but he must be cross-examined.

MATSUOKA and Stahmer on 9 and 10 September 1940, which shows the peaceful intention of the both parties in initiating the negotiations. A greater part of this record was incorporated in the Memoir of Prince KONOYE, which will be offered later. I wish to call the Court's attention especially to point 1, 2, 10, and 11, which show the peaceful understanding between the parties.

cution's exhibit No. 550, transcript pages 6329 - 6343. MATSUOKA's report on the Imperial Conference for the conclusion of the Tri-Partite Pact, in which MATSUOKA declares that this pact was entirely different in nature to the abortive pact negotiated in 1938-1939, and that the most important point in concluding the Pact was to show a firm stand by joining hands with other powers in face of the threatening attitude of the United States, with the ultimate aim of improving the Japanese-American relations.

I now call the Court's attention to prosecution's exhibit No. 552, transcript pages 6,350-6,378, Record of the Investigation Committee of the Privy Council on the conclusion of the Tri-Partite Pact, held on 26 September 1940. Foreign Minister MATSUOKA explained in answering questions by Councillors, among others, that (1) the aim of the Pact is the prevention of war; (2) adjustment of relations with Soviet Russia and the United States was most eagerly sought for; and (3) Japan can choose independently the time and place of participating in the war if the obligation of assistance (Article III of the Pact) should become effective.

I now offer defense document 613, Interrogation of late MATSUOKA, Yosuke, by the International Prosecution Section at the Sugamo Prison, Tokyo, for identification, and tender excerpts therefrom, defense document 613-A(12) and 13 as evidence.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Comyns Carr.

MR. COMYNS CARR: May it please the Tribunal, apart from the absence of the processed copies, the other day when my friend was presenting part of the Russian phase of the defense, he tendered an excerpt from this interrogation of MATSUOKA's and I objected

to it successfully and the Court rejected it on the ground that the prosecution had not used any part of MATSUOKA's interrogation, and, therefore, it was in no better position than any other self-serving statement made after the event.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, MATSUOKA's position is different. As I said before this afternoon, that man is dead, and we cannot wait until he gives the evidence as an individual.

MR. COMYNS CARR: That is no doubt true,
your Honor, but the Court rejected this other
excerpt from the same interrogation on the ground
which I am now putting. And, in my submission, a
mere statement made after the event cannot be
admissible whether the man is dead or alive, or
whether he was accused or whether he was not accused.

THE PRESIDENT: Not according to the rules of evidence.

MR. COMYNS CARR: Now that he is no longer here, he is in no different position from any other person who might have happened to die during the course of this trial and whom other defendants — whose statements taken under those circumstances other defendants wish to use on their behalf.

THE PRESIDENT: Recess for fifteen minutes. (Whereupon, at 1445, a recess was taken until 1500, after which the proceedings were resumed as follows:)

Morse & Selzer

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Cunningham.

Mm. CUNNINGHAM: If your monor please, on the first objection of the prosecution that they did not introduce any excerpts from MATSUMOTO's interrogation and therefore we should not, doesn't seem to hold any water. If there was anything good in it they probably would have introduced it, we can rest assured.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, we have discussed this during the recess, Mr. Cunningham, and this is how we view it.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Well, I would like to give my arguments.

THE P.L. IDENT: Well, you can reply to this.

Well, I say this is my contribution and that

of two other members. We have decided to exclude

evidence -- statements made by any accused as against

other accused in answer to the prosecution offices

unless, of course, the other accused heard what was

seid and accepted it as true. The prosecution invited

us to take that course and we did. We have taken it

in any event. Well, having excluded these interrogation:

so far as they are adverse to other accused, are we to

admit them where they favor other accused? We decided

only the other day we would not. Fre we to go back on that decision?

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Well now, your Honors, on that, if you are willing to go back to the beginning of the prosecution's case and withdraw all the statement; of each of the defendants that were made against other defendants and the interrogations against other defendants, I say that is a good rule for us.

THE PRESIDENT: That is just what we did, Mr. Cunningham. You must have forgotten.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: No, I haven't.

THE PRESIDENT: I am sure your colleagues can assure you that we did that.

the statements of the accused were not taken against the other accused. I say that is good for us and I wouldn't want you to go back on that. But all I am arguing here is what MATSUOKA said about the Tri-Partita Pact, the man who made it, probably should be admitted here because I think it has weight, I think it has relevency and I think it would throw light on the intention which Japan had in entering into the Tri-Partita Pact.

THE PRESIDENT: Just as we admitted statements, say, in correspondence by accused who were, say,

only the other day we would not. Are we to go back on that decision?

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Well now, your Honors, on that, if you are willing to go back to the beginning of the prosecution's case and withdraw all the statement; of each of the defendants that were made against other defendants and the interrogations against other defendants, I say that is a good rule for us.

THE PRESIDENT: That is just what we did, Mr. Cunningham. You must have forgotten.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: No, I haven't.

THE PRESIDENT: I am sure your colleagues can assure you that we did that.

the statements of the accused were not taken against the other accused. I say that is good for us and I wouldn't want you to go back on that. But all I am arguing here is what MATSUOKA said about the Tri-Partite Pact, the man who made it, probably should be admitted here because I think it has weight, I think it has relevency and I think it would throw light on the intention which Japan had in entering into the Tri-Partite Pact.

THE PRESIDENT: Just as we admitted statements, say, in correspondence by accused who were, say,

.

3

5

7

.

10

11

13

15

16 17

19

20

22

24

only the other day we would not. Fre we to go back on that decision?

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Well now, your Honors, on that, if you are willing to go back to the beginning of the prosecution's case and withdraw all the statement; of each of the defendants that were made against other defendants and the interrogations against other defendants, I say that is a good rule for us.

THE PRESIDENT: That is just what we did, Mr. Cunningham. You must have forgotten.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: No, I haven't.

THE PAESIDENT: I am sure your colleagues can assure you that we did that.

the statements of the accused were not taken against the other accused. I say that is good for us and I wouldn't want you to go back on that. But all I am arguing here is what MATSUOKA said about the Tri-Partite Pact, the man who made it, probably should be admitted here because I think it has weight, I think it has relevancy and I think it would throw light on the intention which Japan had in entering into the Tri-Partite Pact.

THE PRESIDENT: Just as we admitted statements, say, in correspondence by accused who were, say,

foreign ministers.

but these interrogations, of course, are not contemporaneous with the execution of the Tri-Partite Fact but come in answer to the prosecution offices.

They are not explanatory of anything but exculpatory of the particular accused who makes the statement. Of course, what MATSUOKA wrote or said about the time of the signing of the pact, and with a view to its execution, would no doubt be material. We have admitted such statements. But here is MATSUOKA saying something to the prosecution offices in explanation of his conduct or in exculpation of himself.

Mh. CUNNINGHAM: Well, your Honor, on those observations I would suggest that I can not draw the line very distinctly between explanation and justification. That is a little difficult for me.

said in explanation of the Tri-Partite Pact is very important when the prosecution is trying to read into the Tri-Partite Pact something which is not there; which is something they are trying to do. Now what is the logical thing to do if a man writes an agreement and you do not understand it or you see it is to be misunderstood; you say to that man, "what did you intend when you made that agreement"? And that is what they said

to him on this occasion. And what he answers is very, very important, especially, when you are trying to get him to say something that he did not intend at the time.

so that I say enything that mATSUOKA said at any time about the explanation of the Tri-Partite Pact would be important. When he said it, only goes to the weight. That is my thought, your Honor, and, if we are interpreting the Tri-Partite Fact, we need the views of the man who wrote the pact.

THE PRESIDENT: Express contemporaneously, certainly, however, we will consider this point, Mr. Cunningham.

1 2

3

4 5

7

8

10

12 13

14

16

18

19

17

20

23

22

24 25 MR. CUNNINGHAM: I pass to the next set of documents. I will refer back, your Honor, in the morning to this 613-A.

Next I want to call the witness MATSUMOTO, Shumichi, Director of the Treaty Department of the Foreign Office at the time of the conclusion of the pact and thereafter. Affidavit No. 1547 is the document.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Tavenner.

MR. TAVENNER: If the Tribunal please, the prosecution would like to object to this affidavit in its entirety and, therefore, we would like to present it before taking up the time in calling the witness.

Peragraph 2 of this affidavit --

THE PRESIDENT: We haven't seen it.

MR. T. VENNER: I beg your pardon.

If the Tribunal please, in the last paragraph of the paragraph marked No. 2, it is at the top of page 2, the witness states the main purposes of the Tri-Partite Pact, quoting the explanations of MATSUOKA at the meeting of the Privy Council. The explanations of MATSUOKA are in evidence as exhibit 552, transcript page 6,350. This is the best evidence and we submit that for that reason paragraph 2 is inadmissible.

THE PRESIDENT: "ell, Mr. Cunningham could

agree to strike that out and substitute the reference you gave.

MR. TAVENNER: That would solve the question as to that paragraph. The rest of it is immaterial -- of that paragraph.

In Section 3 of the affidavit the witness purports to construe the several articles of the pact. The pact was introduced in evidence as exhibit 43 and was read into the transcript at page 6,391. The attempted construction by the witness of the provisions of the pact is quite obviously an invasion of the duty of the Tribunal, and the witness' opinion of the meaning of the several articles and phrases is irrelevant. This objection applies to subsections 3 to 6, inclusive, under division 3 of the affidavit.

Section 4 of the affidavit recites the three letters exchanged at the time of the signing of the Tri-Partite Pact and purports to give a summary of each. These three letters are in evidence: exhibit 555-B, transcript page 6,396; exhibit 555-C, transcript page 6,400; and exhibit 556, transcript page 6,402. These exhibits constitute the best evidence and we submit that the summary of the contents of these letters by the witness is of no probative value.

And, finally, we submit that the reference

1 2

7 8

of the witness, in subsection 3 of section 4 of the affidavit, to an established theory of international law is likewise quite irrelevant.

For the reasons mentioned, we object to the introduction of the affidavit in its entirety.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, Mr. Tavenner, we notice a reference, in paragraph 2 of section 3 on page 2, to an exchange of letters in Tokyo on the day of the conclusion of the pact. Are those letters in evidence?

MR. TAVENNER: Yes, sir.

THE PRESIDENT: Do you know the numbers and the page of the record?

MR. TAVENNER: They are the same documents referred to as exhibits 555-B, 555-C and 556. The page numbers --

THE PRESIDENT: The rest of the affidavit is directed to showing the witness' qualifications, so if you are right there is no need for this affidavit.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Well, your Honor, if the prosecution's theory of the case is right we don't need any evidence either, but I contend that this witness has to show very definite qualifications.

Being the legal adviser to the Foreign Minister of a nation the size of Japan calls for qualifications.

THE PRESIDENT: But all he says in effect is

2

1

4

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

14

15

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

that certain documents passed between the parties.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: That is right, your Honor.

Now we get down to the basis of the thing. The whole question in this cases, as far as the Tri-Partite Pact is concerned, is what interpretation you, as Judges, are going to place upon it. Now, if you only place the interpretation of the pact which is connoted by its phraseology, then I am satisfied; I don't have to have any witnesses or documents to amplify their point of view and other considerations which went into their deliberations and the execution of the pact.

I have tried to give you what MATSUOKA considered in bringing about the pact and that has been
refused. My next best is to give you -- I meant taken
under advisement; I didn't mean that it had been refused.
But my next best evidence is to give you the legal
advice upon which MATSUOKA based his action.

Now, the prosecution has alleged that this instrument was directed as an instrument of war to secure the domination of the world, that it was one of the elements of a conspiracy between these three nations to combine their resources to that end. It is our purpose to show that this pact meant nothing of the kind, that it was a peace pact for the prevention of further outspreading of the war. Those issues are sharply tained.

1 2

Whalen & Duda

THE PRESIDENT: When a document consists of simple words, the court has to construe. Sometimes it contains technical words and the experts have to be resorted to. As far as we know, this pact was couched in simple language, German, I suppose, or Japanese.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: No, English.

THE PRESIDENT: English? Well, if it were in English, that is all the more reason why we should exclude the evidence of Japanese in the meaning of English terms. We wouldn't allow our own foreign office to tell us the meaning of an English treaty, or a treaty in English terms; why fall back on the Japanese?

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Well, that is my theory, your Honor, and my proof is directed to convince you that the prosecution's theory of this is wrong; and that is why I offer this witness, who knows what that language meant because he approved of it.

THE PRESIDENT: If the language were ambiguous or equivocal, we might have to fall back on his assistance to elucidate it.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I am corrected, here, that the negotiations, as I understand it, were conducted in English but the pact was finally reduced to the three languages, Italian, German, and Japanese.

THE PRESIDENT: The English translation is not

challenged?

MR. TAVENNER: No, sir, the translation is not challenged; and there was an English copy of the text in the Japanese document that we introduced in evidence. I believe that the original introduced was the English copy.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Your Honors, I believe it will be helpful to listen to this witness. It is only two pages long, and it certainly forms a basis of Mr. Stahmer, young MATSUOKA, Prince KONOYE, all the witnesses' testimony dovetailed into one theme.

THE PRESIDENT: We want and we need all the help we can get, but we can't abdicate our functions.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Well, your Honor, the defendants are charged with conspiracy, with doing something that was sinister, and I should like to have you see this witness to see the type of man who participated in the deliberations which went into this document.

THE PRESIDENT: That is the most plaintive argument I have ever heard: He couldn't have been a conspirator -- look at him.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: May the witness be called?

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority, the Court

upholds the objection and rejects the testimony which

1 2 3

was about to be offered.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I now call the Court's attention to prosecution's exhibit No. 554, transcript pages 6294 and 6295, the Imperial Rescript issued on the day of the conclusion of the Tri-Partite Pact, which shows most clearly and authoritatively the peaceful intention of Japan.

I now offer in evidence defense document
No. 151--

THE PRESIDENT: Brigadier Nolan.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I wasn't through with my presentation, your Honor.

The text of the Treaty of Mutual Assistance between Great Britain and Poland concluded on 25 August 1939, to show that more than one year prior to the Tri-Partite Pact this Treaty of Mutual Assistance of even stronger nature was concluded in another part of the world, which fact throws much light on the international situation of 1939 and 1940 as the background of the Tri-Partite Pact.

THE PRESIDENT: Brigadier Nolan.

BRIGADIER NOLAN: May it please the Tribunal, this document, No. 151, and the succeeding document, No. 150, were both offered in evidence before the Tribunal and rejected. They were rejected at

1 2

4 5

3

6

,

9

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

pages 17,460 and 17,463. The basis of the objection made at that time was that the documents themselves were relevant to none of the issues in the case.

We submit that they are no more relevant now than they were then.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I submit that if the prosecution agrees that the document, Tri-Partite Pact, was a legal exercise of the sovereign right of Japan in executing it, as this document was the legal right of the sovereign nation of Poland and the other nations, then there is no need for it.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Cunningham, did you know 13 that that document had been tendered before and rejected?

MR. CUNNINGHAM: No, I must confess that I 15 didn't; but it wouldn't make any difference, your 16 Honor, because it was offered for another purpose and if it had been accepted then it would only be referred to here. But I am offering it for a specific purpose here, and I think it is relevant to the issue, and I think it goes to sustain my view.

THE PRESIDENT: I am afraid that some of my colleagues take an unfavorable view of your action in this matter, in tendering again a document already rejected without referring to the fact. None of my colleagues wants to review his decision. The objection

20

21

11

12

is upheld and the document rejected.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I should like to make offer of the next document, 151. What the Tribunal does with it, that is another problem. Of 150, I mean.

I should like to make my offer of proof and then it can be objected to, or whatever. I now offer in evidence defense document No. 150, the text of the Treaty of Mutual Assistance between Great Britain,

France and Turkey, concluded on 19 October 1939, to show that as early as October 1939, a mutual assistance treaty was concluded between belligerents and a neutral country, as in the case of the Tri-Partite Pact. This fact will also clarify the background of the Tri-Partite Pact.

THE PRESIDENT: Brigadier Nolan.

BRIGADIER NOLAN: May it please the Tribunal,
I would make, if I may, the same objection to this
document which was made to the immediately preceding
one. There is no difference or distinction between
them, and I submit that they are covered by the previous
ruling.

THE PRESIDENT: The objection is upheld and the document rejected.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I now offer in evidence defense document 401 (33), an excerpt taken from "Peace and War," to show the events which were occurring simultaneously with the negotiation and conclusion of the Tripartite Pact in September 1940, affecting the situation of the world.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Tavenner.

MR. TAVENNER: If the Tribunal please, we do not question the source of the document, but we object on the ground that it is irrelevant.

I am confident in the course of the decision on similar questions it has been announced that relations of that character were not in issue here, although I do not have in mind the specific ruling of the Tribunal. In any event, the matter is entirely irrelevant to any issue involved in this case, and we object for that

. 17

reason.

.

MR. CUMNINGHAM: If your Honor please, the Tripartite Pact was made as it related to all the events in international political, economic and military situations, and it must be read in the light of history which was going on at the time the pact was executed. It is impossible to understand the pact as of today without at least refreshing our memories on the events which were taking place at the time the pact was being executed and under the conditions which were reflected in it.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority, the Court upholds the objection and rejects the document.

MR. CUMNINGHAM: I now offer a series of decuments in evidence in order to clarify the peaceful intention of Japan in concluding the Tripartite Pact. The first of these is defense document 155, message of the Prime Minister dated 27 September 1940, which is now offered in evidence, and simultaneously with the conclusion of the pact this was made.

It is an excerpt from 777-A. I think it is an excerpt from an exhibit. Anyway it is a message of a Prime Minister.

THE PRESIDENT: KONOYE.

MA. CUNNINGHAM: Prince KONOYE.

THE PRESIDENT: Brigadier Nolan.

BRIGADIER NOLAN: If it please the Tribunal, my document has at the top that it is an excerpt from prosecution document No. 777-A.

Lim. CUNNINGHAM: 777 -- no, it is a basic document.

BRIGADIER NOLAN: If it is a basic document it isn't an exhibit, it has only been marked for identification.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Well, it is a speech -- we can't be bothered with a technicality here -- it is a speech of Prince KONOYE on the day the Tripartite Pact was executed, and it ought to be read in evidence.

BRIGADIER NOLAN: Whether it has been in before or not, your Honor, it merely goes over the old ground again of the advisability of establishing a new order in East Asia.

The document has no certificate attaching to it, and it is a message, to whom I know not. There is no line of it which contains anything of probative value.

is whether or not Prince KONOYE said it, and we contend he said it. And if the prosecution can prove that he didn't say it, why that maybe is some basis for objection.

2

4

6

7

8

9

10

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

• 20

21

23

24

It was marked for identification, as I understand it, before, and this is just an excerpt. But I am not sure about that. My colleague says he is sure about it.

THE PRESIDENT: Only exhibits finally admitted are lettered, and according to the defense this document is already in evidence as exhibit No. 777-A.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Well, just scratch off the A, your Honor, and we will correct that and take it as an excerpt from exhibit 777 for the time being, and if that exhibit number is wrong, we will correct it.

BRIGADIER NOLAN: May it please the Tribunal, there is nothing wrong about the exhibit No. 777, I suppose, but it is quite wrong to say that it is an exhibit in the case. Exhibit 777 is a book from which excerpts were taken. It has only been marked for identification.

Mh. CUNNINGHAM: Mr. USHIBA says that that is a correct statement of the record.

THE PRESIDENT: The objection is overruled and the document admitted for what it is worth, by a majority.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 155 will receive exhibit No. 2734.

2 3 4

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 2734 and received in evidence.)

MR. CUNNINGHAM: (Reading) "Message of the Prime Minister."

"On the occasion of the conclusion of the Three-Power Pact between Japan, Germany and Italy, an Imperial Rescript has been issued, setting forth clearly the aims of our Empire and pointing the path our nation should follow. I am greatly moved by the boundless benevolence of our Sovereign.

"To maintain world peace and to insure the stability of East Asia is indeed the immutable national policy of Japan, firmly rooted in the principle on which our Empire was founded.

"With war breaking out in Europe last autumn, conflict and confusion have spread increasingly over the world. It is an urgent necessity of this moment to devise a measure for the cessation of the disturbances and the restoration of peace. Germany and Italy share with our Empire in the same ideal and aspirations. Accordingly, with a view to joining hands with these Powers to establish a new order in the respective regions, and furthermore to cooperate with them toward the restoration of world peace, Japan has now concluded a

Three-Power Pact. The time has come for our nation to proceed with fresh resolve to construct a new order in Greater East Asia.

"However, to carry out fully the conviction of our country and to enable all nations to find each its proper place is indeed a difficult task. The goal lies far. We must expect to encounter numerous obstacles as we go on.

"I confidently hope that, in obedience to the Imperial will, our people, in order to surmount the present emergency, will make clear the concept of our national policy, unite heart and soul, and overcome any and every obstacle -- and thereby set at ease the august mind of our Sovereign.

"27 September 1940.

"Prime Minister, Prince KONOYE"

THE PRESIDENT: We will adjourn now until half past nine tomorrow morning.

(Whereupon, at 1600, an adjournment was taken until Friday, 13 June 1947, at 0930.)